



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

nl

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,427	01/26/2001	Semih Secer	50671-P021US-10016435	7055
22878	7590	06/01/2007	EXAMINER	
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES INC. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION,LEGAL DEPT. MS BLDG. E P.O. BOX 7599 LOVELAND, CO 80537			JACOBS, LASHONDA T	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2157				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/01/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

MAILED

Application Number: 09/770,427

Filing Date: January 26, 2001

Appellant(s): SECER, SEMIH

JUN 01 2007

Technology Center 2100

Jacob N. Erlich
Reg. No. 24,338
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed November 15, 2006 appealing from the Office action mailed May 31, 2006.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6664978	Kekic et al	12-2003
6047279	Barrack et al	04-2000
6405250	Lin et al	06-2002
6430712	Lewis	08-2002
5615323	Engel et al	03-1997
6664978	kekic et al	12-2003

Art Unit: 2157

6047279	Barrack et al	04-2000
6405250	Lin et al	06-2002
6430712	Lewis	08-2002
5615323	Engel et al	03-1997
6513129	Tentij et al	01-2003
6901440	Bimm et al	05-2005
5734642	Vaishnavi et al	03-1998
6199172	Dube et al	03-2001
5261044	Dev et al	11-1993
6664978	Kekic et al	12-2003
6664978	kekic et al	12-2003

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-21, 23-25, 27-35, 37-46, 48-57, 59-62 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vaishnavi et al (hereinafter, “Vaishnavi”, U.S. Pat. No. 5,734,642).

As per claim 1, Vaishnavi discloses a method for implementing a state model for managing a network coupled to a central management system, said method comprising:

- presenting a user interface a management system to enable a user to define at least one state model for managing at least one network element based on a determined state of said at least one network element (col. 4, lines 28-40);
- presenting a user interface for said central management system to enable a user to define at least one poll service that includes at least one of said at least one state model (col. 5, lines 3-16 and col. 6, lines 26-42); and
- executing said at least one poll service to manage said at least one network element (col. 5, lines 43-56).

As per claim 35, Vaishnavi discloses a method for enabling state-based management of a network, wherein network elements are managed based on their state, said method comprising:

- receiving input from a user at a management system to define at least one state model for managing at least one network element based on a determined state of said at least one network element (col. 4, lines 28-40);
- receiving input from a user at said management system to define at least one poll service that includes at least one of said at least one state model (col. 5, lines 3-16 and col. 6, lines 26-42);
- distributing said at least one poll service including said at least one state model to at least one distributed polling gateway that is communicatively coupled with said at least one network element (col. 5, lines 3-16);

- executing said at least one poll service at said at least one distributed polling gateway to manage said at least one network element (col. 5, lines 43-56); and
- wherein said management system is a central management system (col. 4, lines 5-22).

As per claim 48, Vaishnavi discloses a system for managing network elements based on their state, said system comprising:

- at least one network element (col. 3, lines 57-65);
- one or more distributed gateways for monitoring said at least one network element, said one or more distributed gateways communicatively coupled to a central management system between said at least one network element and said central management system (col. 4, lines 5-22 and col. 5, lines 3-16); and
- at least one state model and managing said at least one network element based on a determined state of said at least one network element, said at least one state model capable of being dynamically defined during runtime (col. 6, lines 26-39).

As per claim 59, Vaishnavi discloses a method for performing state-based management of a network, wherein network elements are managed based on their state, said method comprising:

- executing, on at least one distributed gateway located between the central management system and the network elements at least one user-defined state model for managing at least one network element based on a determined state of said at least one network element, wherein said executing at least one user-defined state model includes polling said at least one network element for data, evaluating said data to determine whether a user-defined state transition condition is satisfied, and triggering a state transition if said user-defined state transition condition is satisfied for a user-defined number of

consecutive polls of said at least one network element (col. 4, lines 5-22 and col. 5, lines 3-16).

As per claim 64, Vaishnavi discloses a system for managing at least one network element comprising:

- at least one network element (col. 3, lines 57-65);
- at least one gateway for monitoring said at least one network element, said at least one gateway communicatively coupled to a central management system between said at least one network element and said central management system (col. 4, lines 5-22 and col. 5, lines 3-16); and
- at least one state model executing on said at least one gateway for managing said at least one network element based on a determined state of said at least one network element, said at least one state model capable of being dynamically defined during runtime (col. 6, lines 26-39).

As per claim 2, Vaishnavi further discloses:

- distributing said at least one poll service to at least one distributed polling gateway that is communicatively coupled with said at least one network element (col. 3, lines 57-66); and
- communicatively coupling said user interface to said at least one distributed polling gateway (col. 4, lines 28-40).

As per claims 3 and 37, Vaishnavi discloses:

- distributing said at least one poll service defined by said user (col. 5, lines 3-12).

As per claim 4, Vaishnavi discloses:

- distributing said at least one poll service defined by said user a plurality of distributed polling gateways for execution thereon (col. 3, lines 57-66).

As per claim **5**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said gateways each have the ability to communicate with one or more network elements in a particular one of communication protocols selected from the group consisting of: SNMP protocol and CMIP protocol (col. 5, lines 23-42).

As per claims **6** and **38**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said at least one distributed polling gateway filters data (col. 6, lines 9-20).

As per claim **8**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said at least one distributed polling gateway executing software to evaluate a user-defined state model condition to determine whether to execute each of said at least one state model (col. 4, lines 5-22 and col. 5, lines 3-16).

As per claims **7**, **39** and **52**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said at least one distributed polling gateway communicating data satisfying said at least one state model to said central management system (col. 6, lines 26-42).

As per claim **9**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said state model condition specifies that said at least one state model is to be executed only for particular network elements (col. 6, lines 26-42).

As per claim **10**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said at least one distributed polling gateway retrieving from said at least one network element needed values for values defined for said at least one state model (col. 6, lines 9-20).

As per claim **11**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said at least one distributed polling gateway executing software to evaluate one or more user-defined equations for said at least one state model utilizing the retrieved variable values (col. 4, lines 5-22 and col. 5, lines 3-16).

As per claims **12, 40** and **53**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said at least one distributed polling gateway executing software to evaluate one or more user-defined state transition conditions for said at least one state model to determine whether said one or more user-defined state transition conditions are satisfied (col. 4, lines 5-22 and col. 6, lines 26-42).

As per claim **13**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said at least one distributed polling gateway determining that said one or more user-defined state transition conditions are not satisfied, then the state of said at least one network element remains unchanged (col. 4, lines 5-22 and col. 6, lines 26-42).

As per claims **14, 41** and **54**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said at least one distributed polling gateway determining that said one or more user-defined state transition conditions are satisfied, then a state transition for said at least one network element is triggered (col. 4, lines 5-22 and col. 6, lines 26-42).

As per claim **16**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said at least one distributed polling gateway determining that said one or more user-defined state transition conditions are satisfied in a user-defined number of consecutive polls of said at least one network element, then a state transition for said at least one network element is triggered (col. 4, lines 5-22 and col. 6, lines 26-42).

As per claims **15, 17, 42** and **55**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein one or more user-defined transition actions for said state transition are triggered in response to said state transition (col. 5, lines 3-16).

As per claims **18** and **43**, Vaishnavi discloses wherein said presenting a user interface on a management system to enable a user to define at least one state model, further comprises:

- providing a user interface that allows a user to define a plurality of states within a state model for a network element (col. 4, lines 28-40 and col. 6, lines 26-42);
- providing a user interface that allows a user to define at least one transition condition that specifies when a transition from one of said plurality of states to another of said plurality of states is to occur (col. 4, lines 28-40 and col. 6, lines 26-42); and
- providing a user interface that allows a user to define at least one transition action to be performed upon the occurrence of said transition (col. 4, lines 28-40 and col. 6, lines 26-42).

As per claims **19** and **44**, Vaishnavi further discloses:

- correlating various different models of said at least one state model (col. 6, lines 26-42).

As per claims **20** and **45**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein software code executes on at least one distributed polling gateway communicatively coupled to said central management system to perform said step of correlating (col. 6, lines 9-20).

As per claims **21** and **46**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said software code triggers an action upon a user-defined pattern of states of said various different models being achieved (col. 5, lines 3-16 and col. 6, lines 26-42).

As per claim **23**, Vaishnavi discloses wherein said at least one network element is selected from the group consisting of:

- ATM, Sonet, router, modem, CMIP EMS, switch OSS, NMS, and web server (col. 3, lines 57-66).

As per claim **24**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said user interface is a graphical user interface (col. 4, lines 29-40).

As per claim **25**, Vaishnavi discloses wherein said at least one state model includes:

- software code specifying at least two user-defined states for said at least one network element (col. 4, lines 28-40 and col. 6, lines 26-42);
- software code specifying at least one transition from a first of said at least two user defined states to a second of said at least two user-defined states (col. 4, lines 28-40 and col. 6, lines 26-42); and
- software code specifying at least one transition action to be performed upon the occurrence of said at least one transition (col. 4, lines 28-40 and col. 6, lines 26-42).

As per claim **27**, Vaishnavi discloses wherein said transition action includes any one or more selected from the group consisting of:

- enabling a particular poll service for said at least one network element, disabling said particular poll service for said at least one network element, enabling a particular state model for said at least one network element, disabling said particular state model for said at least one network element, and triggering one or more user-defined commands to be executed (col. 5, lines 3-16).

As per claim **28**, Vaishnavi discloses wherein said executing said at least one poll service further includes:

- triggering execution of said at least one poll service in response to the occurrence of a user defined event (col. 5, lines 3-16).

As per claim **29**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said user-defined event includes a particular fault condition defined by a user (col. 4, lines 5-22 and col. 6, lines 26-42).

As per claim **30**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said at least one poll service is executed only if a user-defined activation condition for said at least one poll service is satisfied (col. 4, lines 5-22 and col. 6, lines 26-42).

As per claim **31**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said user-defined activation condition specifies that said poll service is for a particular type of network element (col. 5, lines 23-42).

As per claim **32**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said central management system enables a user to dynamically define said at least one poll service during runtime (col. 4, lines 5-22 and col. 6, lines 26-42).

As per claim **33**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said central management system enables a user to dynamically define said at least one state model during runtime (col. 4, lines 5-22 and col. 6, lines 26-42).

As per claim **34**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said central management system enables a user to dynamically modify an existing poll service or state model during runtime (col. 4, lines 5-22 and col. 6, lines 26-42).

As per claims **49** and **61**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said at least one distributed polling gateway software executing on said central management system to enable a user to define said at least one state model, wherein once a user defines said at least one state model (col. 26-42).

As per claim **50**, Vaishnavi further discloses:

- at least one user-defined poll service that includes one or more of said at least one state model (col. 5, lines 23-42).

As per claim **51**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- software executing on said central management system to enable a user to define said at least one poll service, wherein once a user defines said at least one poll service, it is communicated to said one or more distributed gateways for execution thereon (col. 4, lines 5-22 and col. 6, lines 26-42).

As per claim **56**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- at least one pattern-based state model executing thereon to correlate various of said at least one state model (col. 7, lines 9-16).

As per claim **57**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said at least one pattern-based state model specifies a user-defined pattern of states of said various models, and wherein said at least one pattern-based state model

triggers an action upon said user-defined pattern of states being achieved (col. 7, lines 9-16).

As per claim **60**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein said user-defined number of consecutive polls is a plurality of polls (col. 5, lines 3-16).

As per claim **62**, Vaishnavi discloses:

- wherein if said user-defined state transition condition is satisfied for a user-defined number of consecutive polls of said at least one network element, then one or more user-defined transition actions for the user defined state transition are triggered (col. 5, lines 3-16 and col. 6, lines 26-42).

(10) Response to Argument

Appellants argued in substance that:

(a) Vaishnavi does not anticipate Appellant's claimed user interface, input from a user, or user-defined stated model (independent claims 1, 35 and 59 and dependent claim 24) [Appeal Brief page 14].

In response, Applicant's argument filed has been fully considered but is not persuasive.

Vaishnavi discloses a network manager that polls devices to receive information regarding the device through a general-purpose computer (workstation, personal computer, etc.). Although, Vaishnavi does not explicitly disclose a user interface, it is well known in the art that a general-purpose computer has a user interface that allows a user to input information (abstract and col. 4, lines 28-40). Therefore, Vaishnavi discloses a user interface, input from a user and user defined state model.

(b) Vaishnavi does not anticipate Appellant's claimed dynamic definition of a poll service or a state model at runtime (independent claims 48 and 64, and dependent claims 32, 33, 49, 51, and 61) [Appeal Brief page 15].

In response, Applicant's argument filed has been fully considered but is not persuasive.

Vaishnavi discloses a polling manager that provides poll requests to devices of the network to query the status of these devices. Vaishnavi also discloses retrieving the previous state and status information before the model control module is initialized (col. 5, lines 6-16 and col. 6, lines 20-35). Therefore, Vaishnavi discloses a user interface, input from a user and user defined state model.

(c) Vaishnavi does not anticipate Appellant's claimed user-defined state transition conditions (independent claim 59 and dependent claims 12-14, 16, 18, 40, 41, 43, 53, 54 and 62) [Appeal Brief pages 15-16].

In response, Applicant's argument filed has been fully considered but is not persuasive.

Vaishnavi discloses a network manager that receives status information from a network and provide monitoring capability to determine the status of manageable devices on the network (col. 4, lines 49-62). Therefore, Vaishnavi discloses user-defined state transition conditions.

(d) Vaishnavi does not anticipate Appellant's claimed number of consecutive polls (independent claim 59 and dependent claim 16) [Appeal Brief pages 16-17].

In response, Applicant's argument filed has been fully considered but is not persuasive.

Vaishnavi discloses a polling manager that provides poll requests to devices of the network to query the status of these devices. The poll manager may include an internal clock or timer to trigger the transmission of the poll request (col. 5, lines 6-16). Therefore, Vaishnavi discloses a number of consecutive polls.

(e) Vaishnavi does not anticipate Appellant's claimed distributed polling gateway that filters data or that only communicates data satisfying a state model (dependent claims 6, 7, 38, 39, and 52) [Appeal Brief pages 17-18].

In response, Applicant's argument filed has been fully considered but is not persuasive.

Vaishnavi discloses a network manager that polls devices to receive information regarding the device through a general-purpose computer (workstation, personal computer, etc.). Although, Vaishnavi does not explicitly disclose a user interface, it is well known in the art that a general-purpose computer has a user interface that allows a user to input information (abstract and col. 4, lines 28-40). Therefore, Vaishnavi discloses a user interface, input from a user and user defined state model.

(f) Vaishnavi does not anticipate Appellant's claimed user-defined equations (dependent claim 11) [Appeal brief page 18].

In response, Applicant's argument filed has been fully considered but is not persuasive.

Vaishnavi discloses a network manager that receives status information from a network and provide monitoring capability to determine the status of manageable devices on the network (col. 4, lines 49-62). Therefore, Vaishnavi discloses user-defined equations.

(g) Vaishnavi does not anticipate Appellant's claimed user-defined transition actions, user-defined pattern of states, user-defined event, or user defined activation condition (dependent claims 15, 17, 18, 21, 28-30, 42, 43, 46, 55, 57, 62) [Appeal Brief pages 18-19].

In response, Applicant's argument filed has been fully considered but is not persuasive.

Vaishnavi discloses a network manager that receives status information from a network and provide monitoring capability to determine the status of manageable devices on the network (col.

Art Unit: 2157

4, lines 49-62). Therefore, Vaishnavi discloses user-defined transition actions, user-defined pattern of states, user-defined event, or user defined activation condition.

(h) Vaishnavi does not anticipate Appellant's claimed poll service that is for a particular type of network element (dependent claim 31) [Appeal Brief pages 19-20].

In response, Applicant's argument filed has been fully considered but is not persuasive.

Vaishnavi discloses a polling manager that provides poll requests to devices of the network to query the status of these devices (col. 5, lines 6-16 and col. 6, lines 20-35). Therefore, Vaishnavi discloses poll service that is for a particular type of network element.

(i) Vaishnavi does not anticipate dependent claims 2-5, 8-10, 19, 23-25, 27, 34, 44, 45, 50 and 56 because they depend upon allowable independent claims.

In response, Applicant's argument filed has been fully considered but is not persuasive.

Vaishnavi discloses dependent claims 2-5, 8-10, 19, 23-25, 27, 34, 44, 45, 50 and 56 because they depend upon rejected claims.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

LaShonda T Jacobs
Examiner
Art Unit 2157



Conferees:

William Vaughn

Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit



WILLIAM VAUGHN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100



BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER